



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE WHOLL CHARGES aswell of the dietts and provisions necessarye for the furniture of the same provided for the Queenes Ma^{ties} most honorable privye Counsell at her Graces Starre Chamber at westminster during this Hillary Terme in the XXXVIth yeare of her highnes most prosperous Raigne As also the wages of Certeine Officers and Ministers of the same. With—Vⁿ XVII^a VI^d layde out by the Vssher of the same Court as appeareth by his Bill Remayning—

CLXVIⁿ V^a V^d. ob.
XI^o April 1594.
Ex^{ar} ¹ Suma p Ric
Sutton in absen' Jo.
Thomson Aud.

Jo. Puckering C. S.

W. Burghley.

XXIX^o Aprillis
1594.

Mr. Staneley I praye you paye out Mr. Nicholas Smith the some of one hundred and threescore pounds thirtene shillings penny halpeny which some with three hundred pounds payd by you to him in Michas and Hillary termes last doth aswell make full payment of this Liberate² as of the some of two hundred fourscore fourtene pounds, seven shillings eight pence uppon his Liberate for Michas terme aforesayd, 1593 as by the same apereth.³

W^m Skyenner

2. *Letters of Bancroft and Buchanan on the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty, 1849, 1850.*

THE letters printed below are taken from the voluminous papers and correspondence of the late Hon. Edmund Burke, of New Hampshire. Mr. Burke was a native of Vermont, but at the age of twenty-one removed to New Hampshire, in which state he held his residence until his death in 1882.

A lawyer by profession, he was from the days of Gen. Jackson's presidency down to Mr. Buchanan's administration, inclusive, among the most notable of Democratic politicians and ablest of political writers in New England.

He first made his mark as editor of the *Argus* newspaper, published in Claremont, New Hampshire, in 1833. The next year, removing to the adjoining town of Newport, he consolidated the *Argus* with the *Spectator* published in that town, the consolidated

¹ For "examinatur."

² A writ ordering a payment to be made and beginning with this word.

³ This note is not in the same handwriting as the rest of the manuscript.

sheet becoming the *Argus and Spectator*, a weekly journal which has flourished ever since.

In those days, when the metropolitan dailies had but scant circulation outside of urban centres, the country press wielded an influence in the discussion of political questions and in the moulding of public opinion little comprehended to-day. In such sphere of editorial direction, Mr. Burke had no superior. Having early in his young manhood espoused the Democratic faith, his editorials were so vigorous and aggressive in style, so able and incisive in statement, that they soon attracted the widest attention; so wide, indeed, that in 1837 he was invited by the late President Polk and Felix M. Grundy, then Speaker of the House and U. S. Senator respectively, to take the editorial chair of the *Nashville Union*, the leading Democratic newspaper published in Tennessee. After careful consideration of this offer, he concluded to accept it, and proceeded to wind up his affairs in connection with the *Argus and Spectator*, in order that he might take up his new line of work at Nashville with as little delay as possible. But his personal and political friends in New Hampshire, loath to have him leave them, urgently pressed him to remain among them, promising among other things to send him to Congress at the next election if he would do so. In those halcyon days of the New Hampshire Democracy, a Democratic nomination meant a sure election, and under such inviting prospects, Mr. Burke recalled his acceptance of the Nashville proposition and resumed his editorial labors on the *Argus and Spectator*, broken in upon from time to time as his three congressional terms, dating from 1839, demanded.

The general rule in New Hampshire has been to give a man in Congress only two terms, but it so happened that a Whig Congressman from Tennessee by the name of Arnold furiously assailed both Mr. Burke and his adopted state in a debate on the floor of the House. Among other things, Mr. Arnold demanded to know if Mr. Burke was "a descendant of 'Burke, the Burker,' or some other Burke?" When Mr. Burke arose to reply, he said he would answer the gentleman from Tennessee in true Yankee fashion by asking him another question. He would ask "if the gentleman from Tennessee was a descendant of Benedict Arnold, or of some other Arnold?" This happy retort brought down the cheers of the House, and his constituents, in their pride and delight at the spirited defence of New Hampshire and her people, that followed, gave him another term.

During his congressional career, Mr. Burke proved himself to be a ready and forceful debater, and as a member of important com-

mittees was often designated, because of his literary ability and his vigorous style of writing, to write the reports of the committees to be laid before the House. His letters also, known as the Bundelcund letters, written in favor of a low tariff, were so vigorous in presentation, so logical in statement, and so convincing in argument that they were circulated in every part of the country, and undoubtedly contributed in a large measure towards the formulation and enactment of the tariff act of 1846.

Taking active part in the presidential campaign of 1844, which resulted in the election of Mr. Polk, he was, soon after the inaugural ceremonies in Washington, tendered the office of Commissioner of Patents, a tender which he accepted. In his administration of that office it is believed that he brought it up to a higher standard of efficiency than it had ever known before. At the expiration of Mr. Polk's term, Mr. Burke was offered a connection with Mr. Thomas Ritchie as joint editor of the *Washington Union*, the then Democratic organ of the country. He remained in such connection one year, when, not agreeing with the more conservative ideas and methods of Mr. Ritchie, he withdrew from the partnership and resumed his residence in New Hampshire.

From that time forward he devoted himself to his profession, and especially in the line of patent law. But in his devotion to the law he by no means gave up his activities in political and editorial fields. To those familiar with New Hampshire politics, indeed, it goes without saying that Mr. Burke was largely instrumental in bringing about the nomination of Franklin Pierce for the presidency in 1852. Unfortunately, the relations of the two men became much strained during Mr. Pierce's incumbency of the presidential office, and the result was the demoralization of the Democratic party in the state, and its loss to the Democratic column of states thereafter.

In his eleven years of Washington life, Mr. Burke had made the acquaintance of the most distinguished men of the nation. His strong personality, devotion to party and stout maintenance of his political opinions won alike the admiration of his friends and the respect of his foes. Hence his correspondence was large and varied and covered many topics of public concern.

GEO. E. BELKNAP.

I. BANCROFT TO BUCHANAN.¹

NEW YORK, 16 Nov. 1849.

Dear Mr Buchanan

Yours of the 14. is just received. I have not a copy of your letter to me on the Mosquito affair; but remember its substance. You sent an

¹ From a copy enclosed in No. II.

extract of your letter to Mr. Hise, in which you showed the total want of title on the part of Great Britain to any portion of Central America. To me, you wrote to consult with the Peruvian Minister ; and if possible to prevent Lord Palmerston's assuming the protectorate of Costa Rica, which state seemed to you not unlikely to place itself under England's wing. On the general subject, you wrote, that the disturbances and disputes among the states of Central America were so great, the president hardly knew what course : and *intimated* that some degree of order and union there must precede the intervention of the U. S. in their behalf.

This I followed up to Clayton, according to the spirit of your letter. Clayton replied by a copy of his letter to Squier, and instructing me to *converse* with the minister of Costa Rica, dissuading him from asking the protectorate of Great Britain. He also directed me to *converse* with Palmerston ; and in a certain emergency of which I was to judge, to *protest*,—and even menace a little. I was writing that protest as my recall came. Four days' more would have seen it in Lord P.'s hands.

Clayton will either back out, or throw the responsibility on Congress.

I kept a copy of Clayton's letter to me. Your letter to me on the Mosquito business was prudent and right ; and considering you had just signed a treaty for half of Mexico, went as far as was proper at the moment. Clayton went further, but I have no doubt, shrinks back from his own daring.

I went deeply into the study of the question : both as regards the tone of feeling in England : and as it regards title. I read in Paris every scrap of paper, relating to the negotiations in 1783, by which England pledged itself to evacuate the Mosquito Territory ; and had drawn from documents, which no one in our time but myself had read, which I may say no one ever before read (for I read English, French and Spanish documents), the clearest evidence as to the intent of the parties in 1783.

You are very good in your remarks about my history. I shall soon be at work again. My wife joins me in best regards.

Ever faithfully your friend,

GEORGE BANCROFT.

II. BUCHANAN TO BURKE.

Strictly Private and Confidential

Wheatland 3 Dec : '49.

My dear Sir

It is proper that you should know exactly what the late administration did in regard to the Mosquito question. I, therefore, send you the draft of the original instructions to M^r. Hise and a letter which I received from M^r. Bancroft. These you can frank back to me.

In order to understand the subject it is necessary to revert to the circumstances of the Country when Mr. Hise was sent to Guatemala. We had just closed the war with Mexico and indeed at the date of his instructions we had not learned the fate of the Treaty of Peace. The

Treaty was dated on the 22 Feb: 1848, the ratifications of it were exchanged at Queretaro on the 30th May and on the 3 June the Instructions to Hise were dated. It was not a moment to take a stand on the Mosquito question; although neither M^r Polk nor any member of his Cabinet ever thought of abandoning the Monroe declaration at least so far as North America was concerned. We had no information from Central America at the time except that the five states of w^o it had been composed were in a state of the utmost confusion, involved in civil wars and utterly incapable of helping themselves. One of these Costa Rica was believed to be willing to ask the protection of Great Britain. M^r Hise was sent abroad to cultivate an American spirit and a spirit of reunion among them, in order to enable them to resist the encroachments of Great Britain. Had they refused to do anything for themselves or had been willing to cast themselves in the arms of England, as Costa Rica was, it would have been difficult to help them. M^r Hise was delayed from sickness and various causes in reaching Central America to so late a period *that at the close of the late administration we had not received from him the information as to the State of the Country which he was instructed to communicate.* Indeed, according to my best recollection we had not heard from him at all after he reached Guatemala. We, therefore, did not tell England she should not interfere with the rights of the Central American States on the Isthmus; though I think you will admit that enough appears on the face of his instructions and in the instructions to M^r Bancroft to prove conclusively what was our determination. The moment had not arrived; but there is nothing more certain than that we would have resisted the pretensions of England: and I think this may be abundantly inferred from what we had done before the close of the late administration.

These papers are communicated to you in sacred confidence. I send Bancrofts letter because I think you ought to know what Clayton has done. I write in the midst of company and should like to write more but cannot do it without losing a mail. You can return the papers to me under M^r Foote's frank.

With my kind regards for M^{rs} Burke I remain always

y^r friend

JAMES BUCHANAN

M^r Burke.

III. BUCHANAN TO MCCLERNAND.

Private

Wheatland 2^d April 1850

My dear Sir

I never did believe that the sketch of the Nicaragua Treaty presented in the New York Tribune a few days ago could be correct, until I perceived that it was at least indirectly sanctioned by the Government Organs at Washington. According to this sketch the two first articles

ought to be resisted to the utmost extremity. They are neither more nor less than a solemn stipulation on the part of the United States to Great Britain, that at no future period, shall we ever annex to our Country, under any circumstances, any portion of the vast country of Central America, extending from North West to South East 1000 miles, and in breadth from 90 to 250 miles. Nay more it is a stipulation by which Great Britain, in fact, guarantees as against the United States, the integrity of the different States of Central America: and if we had just cause of war against these States at the present moment, and should conquer any portion of their territory, Great Britain, under the Treaty, might and would require us to abandon it, because we have pledged our faith to her, that we "will not take, use, hold, occupy nor exercise dominion over any portion of Central America, henceforth and forever." Let us enter into a similar stipulation with Great Britain in regard to Mexico, and our limits are forever bounded by the Rio Grande, for such would be the true purport and meaning of our engagement with that over-reaching power. The policy was steadily pursued by Mr Polks administration of urging the nations on the continent not to suffer Great Britain or any other European Power to interfere in their concerns. This policy was distinctly announced in my instructions to Mr Slidell of Nov 10-1845, to which I refer you, (page 71 and 72, Executive Document No. 52 of the first session of the 30th Congress) and was uniformly pursued throughout the whole administration.

And what will the Nicaragua Treaty effect, if its provisions have been correctly stated? Instead of the protectorate of the Mosquito King, which Great Britain had assumed without a particle of right, she will become substantially the protector of all the five States of Guatemala, Honduras, St. Salvador, Nicaragua and Costa Rica. Her province of British Honduras, or Belize, lies immediately north of these States, Jamaica is in front of them and the Island of Trinidad is to the South. She will command the whole Carribbean Sea: and all the States along the sea as well as on the opposite Coast of the Pacific will consider her their protector under Treaty stipulations, against what she terms "the exorbitant ambition" of our Republic. Can it be that Democratic Senators will sanction this Treaty?

I say nothing about the stipulations of the Treaty for the neutrality of the Canal, and of all vessels within a reasonable distance from the ports at its termini and for the protection of the workmen &c &c. Had these stipulations been made with Nicaragua and not with Great Britain there could have been no objection to them. In the case of our Treaty with New Granada we were willing that New Granada should treat with England on this subject. But even in that case, we never for a single moment thought of placing ourselves in the power of Great Britain by entering into any Treaty stipulations with her on the subject. Even in regard to the canal there the case of New Granada and Mr. Polks Message quoted by the National Intelligencer on the 29th of April has no application. Still had the Treaty been confined to the neutrality of the canal it would

not have been alarming ; though wrong in principle to treat with her at all on such a subject.

If Sir Henry Bulwer can succeed in having the two first provisions of this Treaty ratified by the Senate he will deserve a British peerage. The consideration for our concessions is the relinquishment of the claim to the protectorate of the Mosquito Shore—so absurd and so unfounded that it has been ridiculed even by the London Times. Truly Sir Henry has brought this claim to a good market, when he found a purchaser in Mr Clayton.

The Treaty altogether reverses the Monroe Doctrine, and establishes it against ourselves rather than European Governments.

I had no intention of writing you a letter when I commenced. I intended merely to drop some hasty hints, to the Editor of [a] Democratic Journal. As I advanced the thought struck me that I would send them to you as suggestions for what they were worth. I regret that my personal acquaintance with you is so slight. This has not been my fault, for I have always entertained for you the highest respect. At all events you will pardon these hasty suggestions from one Democrat to another—on a question of vast importance and attach to them such importance as you think they may deserve.

Yours very respectfully

JAMES BUCHANAN.

Hon : John A. McClernand.

IV. BUCHANAN TO BURKE.

Private and Confidential

Wheatland 30 May 1850.

My dear Sir

I have received your favor of the 27th Instant and am sincerely sorry to learn that tomorrow will be the last day of your connection with the Union. Your loss will be seriously felt by the party throughout the Country and I know not how M^r Ritchie can supply your place. I do not blame you, however, for retiring from the establishment to a more lucrative and less laborious situation.

Grund's effort was one of deep design. It was intended to draw me from the platform on which I have stood ever since my Berks County letter in 1847 and identify me with those who hold that whilst Congress possess the power to acquire new territories, they cannot afterwards preserve and govern them. I am not in public life and don't either know or much care whether I shall ever be : and I do not choose to write to M^r Foote in praise of the Clay Compromise. I think there are some things in it very objectionable, but if I were in the Senate, after having tried to amend it, and especially to reduce the limits of California, I might vote for it as a pis aller. How can it settle the question? The North vote for it, because the Mexican law and the law of nature will exclude slavery from the territories ; and the South because the Constitution of

the United States has repealed the Mexican law and enables them to take and hold their slaves there. The Compromise will only therefore transfer the controversy to the territories to be brought back again from thence to Congress with additional acrimony. The Missouri Compromise would have finally settled the dispute ; but it is now too late. After the South have fought the last Presidential contest upon the doctrine of non-intervention, I do not see how it is possible for them to change their position, especially after the Northern Democracy have come up to it.

I feel much indebted to you for your article concerning myself. It would be every word correct if you had qualified the last sentence but one in accordance with what I have stated. But let it stand as it is.

The Nicaragua Treaty is even worse than I had supposed. It does not destroy the protectorate of England over the Mosquitoes ; but merely prevents her from using it for the erection of fortifications, &c., a thing wholly unnecessary to enable her to carry it into effect. Throughout Mr. Polk's administration, it was our steady policy to indoctrinate all the Southern nations on this Continent to avoid all political connexion with European nations and to establish an American policy. This Treaty reverses our principle and makes Great Britain the protector of the whole of Central America and establishes her influence there upon sure foundations. In the case of New Granada, we doubted much whether we would even guarantee to that Republic the neutrality of her small province of the isthmus : we never hesitated a single moment in the policy of refusing, should this become necessary, to enter into any Treaty with Great Britain on the subject. The furthest we were willing to go was to consent that New Granada might receive similar guarantees from Great Britain and France ; but to these we were to be no parties.

The only circumstance which could approach an equivalent to us, *would have been an absolute security, in war with Great Britain as well as in peace*, for our free intercourse through the canal with our possessions on the West Coast of America. To accomplish this the neutrality of the vessels not merely through the canal but from the port of their clearance to those of their destination ought to have been required. Great Britain would not have granted this. With British Honduras on the north, Jamaica on the North East, and her protectorate of the Mosquitoes and Central America on the Continent, the Caribbean Sea will be as completely under her control as the British Channel. In case of war with us, she will now be able to cut off entirely our intercourse through the Canal with California and Oregon. We have thus placed in her hands the most powerful weapon against ourselves.

To get clear of this Treaty will some day cost us a bloody war with Great Britain should she remain as powerful as she is at present. And yet if the Herald is to be believed, there were but ten votes in opposition to it !

from your friend

JAMES BUCHANAN.

Hon: Edmund Burke.